Editeur: Editions Trintexte ISSN (P) ISSN 0715-8920 (E) 1480-817X ISSN (L) 0715-8920

A comparative analysis of the noun of action ending in –ish in the modern Turkic languages

Aynel Enver Meshadiyeva

Azerbaijan National Academy of Sciences,
the Institute of Linguistics named after Nasimi,
Baku, Azerbaijan
aynel.meshadiyeva@mail.ru

Abstract

On many issues there are different kinds of disagreements of the substantive forms` composition of the verb. They are associated primarily with the definition of the grammatical indices` functions of "objectified" action in the Turkic languages. The problem of determining of the quantitative composition of non-personal forms of the Turkic verb can be classified as the least illuminated and controversial issues of Turkology. It is impossible to reveal the complex nature of non-personal forms in modern Turkic languages without determining the composition of the nouns of action, and clarifying their functions. A number of studies on general and particular questions of morphology of the Turkic languages that have appeared in recent years in the Turkic linguistics, not only proved the need to continue studying this problem, but also paved the way for them. The purpose of this paper is the revelation of linguistic nature and the specific features of the action noun ending in -ish in the Turkic languages and determine its functional-semantic potential and intercategorial relations in the system of inflection.

Keywords:*The noun of action ending in–ish,Turkic languages,Non-personal forms.*

1. Introduction

The one of the controversial issues of linguistics is the question of belonging of non-personal forms of the verb to the parts of speech, i.e., establishing if they are a part of a system of verb or noun parts of speech or they form a special part of speech. Non-personal forms of the verb having a number of features are beyond the usual verbal categories. They express actions without any indication of person and number, and they are close to the noun parts of speech by syntactic functions and cannot serve as the predicate in a sentence. The originality of the non-personal forms of the verb becomes apparent in the fact that, historically, they go back to nouns, but in the development process they tend to be verb, getting verbal categories, and maintaining the characteristic peculiarities.

Non-personal forms of the verb since ancient times had mostly various semantic shades of actions. Some non-personal forms of the verb in Turkic languages, in addition to the attributive functions are passed the values of the infinitive, the action noun and a verbal noun. For example, in Tatar language forms ending in –asi, -achak, -mali/-makli, -uli –ishli/-ishlik, etc. in addition to the attributive functions, they passed the values of the infinitive, a verbal noun and the noun of action.

Despite the fact that most of the ancient non-personal forms of the verb in the Turkic languages over time are complicated by other morphological and lexical functions, the basic meaning of these forms have been survived nowadays in the modern Turkic languages.

Ancient non-personal forms of the verb had complex modal nuances, which were observed during the development and establishment of this category in the Turkic languages.

Tense forms of the indicative mood (-gan, -asi, -galak, -ip, and etc.) are formed on the base of some non-personal forms of the verb. It proves the fact that the development of non-personal forms of the verb in the Turkic languages is closely connected with the development of the Turkic system of the indicative.

Some researchers strongly separated the infinitive from the verb, considering that the infinitive is a neither predicative nor attributive form of the verb, and it is the noun with the verbal stem, and therefore the infinitive was examined as a special part of speech. Other researchers have noted that the infinitive is "a verbal nominative", i.e. the original form of the verb.

The problem of the infinitive forms with its compound lexical-semantic, morphological-syntac-tic features and stylistic features is important in the grammars of Turkic languages.

In most Turkic languages non-personal forms of the verb do not become the subject of a special study. In the Turkic languages, these forms of the verb have not undergone systematic study. In other words, this question still remains unresolved.

Consequently, the study of the infinitive category, as one of the non-personal forms of the verb, and separate infinitive forms in the Turkic languages is one of the urgent problems of Turkic linguistics.

Turkological literature offers several terms about designation of the infinitive grammatical category: indefinite form of the verb, indefinite mood, inconclusive mood, the target verbal form, the target verb or the supine, the infinitive, the Masdar, an indefinite-nominal form of the verb, the verb noun, the noun of action, verbal nouns, and etc.

So, V. A. Gordlevsky, P. M. Melioransky, A. Kazimbek, N. F. Katanov called the infinitive as the "indefinite mood", A. N. Borovkov, N. K. Dmitriev, A. N. Kononov – as "infinitive", I. A. Batmanov, N. L. Dyrenkova, V. V. Reshetov– as "verbal nouns", V. M. Nasilov, V. Aliev, B. K. Kutlymuratov, N. A. Baskakov, M. B. Balakaev, B. Toychubekova – as "the nouns of action," A. M. Scherbak - "substantive verbal nouns", and etc.

So, in Azerbaijani linguistics the considered non-personal form of the verbs is called as Masdar. This term began to be used in grammars of the Azerbaijani language from the 30-ies of the 20th century.

It is interesting to note that the term Masdar that borrowed from Arabic language, was also recorded in the Georgian language. The term is founded in the writings of M. Kashgari and some of the Eastern linguists.

In Turkology some scientists-linguists often identified the concept of the infinitive and the verbal name (M. Huseynzadeh, A. Akhundov).

In the opinion of L. Khanbutayeva concepts of verbal noun the infinitive are also identical.

In this regard, the following statement of L. Khanbutayeva is noteworthy: "In order to prove this fact, we should to study the etymology of the infinitive in diachronic aspect" [Khanbutayeva, 2003].

The statement of R. Madatova is impartial for this reason: "The language of written monuments shows that two syllables words which consists of the affix –maq/-mek were derived from the infinitive and moved into the category of nouns in the process of development, for example: çaxmaq-hammer, qarmaq-hook, etc." [Madatova, 1997].

Some scholars identify concepts of verbal nouns and nouns of actions [Chommadov, 1992].

In Russian linguistics the most generally used term for this non-personal forms of the verb with reference to the Turkic languages was the term infinitive.

The statement of K. G. Ishbaev is most revealing in this respect: "the term "infinitive" /lat. Infinitivus - undefined/ does not fully correspond to the nature of this category in the Turkic languages as well. But it is good that, being an international term, it does not require calque and is generally understood" [Ishbaev, 1975].

We also believe that the most appropriate and successful term applied to the category of the infinitive in the Turkic languages, is the term "infinitive".

It is remarkable to note that in Turkology in the 60-80s the most generally used term was the term the noun of action (Iskhakov, 1960, Kutlymuratov, 1968, Toychubekova, 1968, Meliyev, 1976, etc.). These researchers consider the term "nouns of action" as the most successful term with reference to this category in the Turkological literature. They prove this point of view by the fact that the terms "infinitive" and "verbal nouns" semantically do not reveal neither semantic nor morphological essence of these forms.

In this regard, B. K. Kutlymuratov said: "And indeed in the Turkic languages, including the Karakalpak language, this category should be marked as the term "nouns of action" and it is necessary to consider nouns of action along with participles and gerunds in the system of the functional forms of the verbs" [Kutlymuratov, 1963].

B. K. Kutlymuratov also notes that: "... From all of the above mentioned terms, term "nouns of actions is more appropriate ", as the terms "verbal nouns" and "infinitive" does not fully meet the content of the category of the action nouns in Turkic languages, for the reason that the verbal signs are not stored in isolated verbal nouns (nouns and adjectives), and the verbal signs stored in the nouns of action" [Kutlymuratov, 1963].

N. Tydykova also holds this opinion: "Indeed, the terms "indefinite mood", "masdar", "infinitive", "the verbal name", "verb name" do not clearly reflect the semantic or the morphological essence of the category of "action noun" [Tydykova, 2007].

Until now, scholars have not come to a consensus about the nature of the infinitive as a separate grammatical category.

In this regard, N.K. Dmitriev writes: "...the very concept of the infinitive as a grammatical category quite shaky and uncertain. The infinitive is something between inflective verbal forms and verbal nouns. The specificity of the infinitive is very different in various languages "[Dmitriev, 1948].

From the above statement it follows that unlike some scholars N.K. Dmitriev does not consider the infinitive as a separate grammatical category and does not identify it with the verbal nouns.

The following statement of N.A. Baskakov is noteworthy regarding the infinitive forms (nouns of action by the terminology of N.A. Baskakov): "The review of functional nouns of the verb forms and their classification show that, first, they fully preserve the semantics of action process or condition, and second, that what is the characteristic to the secondary nouns of action, - at the same time are indices

of grammatical categories of mood and tense, though these categories are originated in the noun of action historically through the functional attributive forms (e.g., forms ending in –gi - and ending in –mak/-mek, which acquired the semantics of mood through the relevant participial forms ending in –gysi/-gisi, -makshy/-mekshi or forms ending in –arlyk/-erlik; -ganlyk/-genlik, etc., which a temporary value is common with the original participial forms ending in –ar/-er, -gan/-gen, and etc.). The nouns of action are neutral by themselves concerning grammatical categories of mood and tense "[Baskakov, 1952].

The work of M.A. Kazimbek entitled "General grammar of Turkish-Tatar language", as one of the first works on the study of the infinitive in the Turkic languages, initiated the study of this non-personal form of the verb in all aspects. In his work M. A. Kazimbek denotes infinitive by the term the noun of action.

The research works of N.K. Dmitriev, N.A. Baskakov, V.M. Nasilov, A.N. Kononov, I.A. Batmanov, L.A. Pokrovskaya, B.A. Serebrennikov, N.Z. Hajiyeva, V.D. Arakin, A. Damirchizadeh, A. Akhundov, V. Aliyev, G. Mirzazadeh, M. Huseynzadeh, S. Jafarov, M., A.E. Meshadiyeva, L. Khanbutayeva, R. Madatova, and etc. have a great importance for the study of the infinitive in the Turkic languages.

In the scientific work of V. Aliyev entitled "Non-personal forms of the verb in the Azerbaijani language. Masdar. Baku, 1986" [Aliyev, 1986] the history of the study of infinitive and their paradigmatic and syntagmatic features were thoroughly investigated.

In the doctoral thesis of R. Madatova entitled "Masdar in the written monuments of the Azerbaijani language of 13-18th centuries" the author examines grammatical features of infinitives in written monuments of the Azerbaijani language on the basis of the rich textual material, as well as trying to determine the dynamics of its historical development [Madatova, 1997].

In the "Comparative-historical grammar of Turkic languages. The morphology " infinitive is interpreted in the following way: "the Infinitive as a special verbal form, called action, state or process, without specifying its relation to the person and number or reality" [1988].

Some scholars (N.K. Dmitriev, A.N. Kononov, B.A. Serebrennikov, N.Z. Hajiyev, K.G. Ishbaev) note that the development of the infinitive in the various Turkic languages were uneven. In a result of this the features of usage and stages of formation of the infinitive forms are different. They also believe that the infinitive in the modern Turkic languages does not correspond to infinitive forms recorded in Old Turkic language.

The statement of N.K. Dmitriev is noteworthy on the development of the infinitive in the Turkic languages: "It turns out that the living Turkic languages, in general, could, so to speak, dispense with the infinitive and that the development of the infinitive is obliged to some external impulse from the powerful literary language: Arabic with his masdars, and in our time – Russian, with its infinitive, playing significant grammatical and lexical role" [Dmitriev, 1948].

The observations of V.D. Arakin are certain concerning the historical development of the infinitive in the Turkic languages: "In all probability, the infinitive began to emerge only after the disintegration of the All-Turkic language for separate languages" [Arakin, 1988].

In our view, it is difficult to disagree with the above hypothesis of V.D. Arakin, which is confirmed by fairly strong facts.

So, V. D. Arakin argues his hypothesis by the fact of absence of common forms of the infinitive in modern Turkic languages, which was able to ascend to one of the All-Turkic infinitive form, and by the fact of uneven development of the infinitive forms in modern Turkic languages.

The historical development of the infinitive in Azerbaijani and Turkic linguistics has been highlighted in the works of G. Bagirov (1971), Kh. Mirzazade (1962), A.E. Meshadiyeva (2012, 2013, 2015), R. Madatova (1997), and etc.

But despite the diversity of interpretations of the infinitive, the essence of this verbal form remains identical. In other words, the infinitives (Masdar, verbal nouns) at the same time have both verbal and noun features.

In Turkic languages the infinitive is one of the non-personal forms of the verb, which is characterized by morphological features, syntactic functions, and certain semantics. Infinitive forms do not only differ from the personal forms of the verb, but also from other non-personal forms of the verb (participle, gerund).

Regarding the category of the infinitive in the modern Turkic languages the interpretations of some scientists and linguists are of interest.

So, in the work of S. Jafarov and A. Abbasov, "The infinitive of Azerbaijani language" the infinitive is determined by the following way: "Masdars are called as verbs, which call only The noun of action and not having the categories of tense, person and number" [Jafarov, Abbasov, 1946].

In the book entitled "The modern Azerbaijani language" the infinitive is characterized by the following way: "Masdars that is not concerned with tense and the category of the person may show only the name of the verb through the sign of a special mood" [The modern Azerbaijani language, 1980].

Infinitive forms in modern Turkic languages differ among themselves, i.e. each infinitive form has some inherent similar and distinctive features.

Despite the availability of studies devoted to the nominal forms of the Turkic verb, many issues still remain controversial and unexplored.

The category of "noun of action" is ambiguous, not clearly defined their boundaries, there are differences in opinion regarding their composition. In this context, questions about of the morphological nature, grammatical meaning and linguistic functions of nominal forms require a more deep study.

The subject of this research are features of the formation, semantics and functioning of the noun of action ending in -ish in the grammatical system of the non-personal forms of the verb in the Turkic languages.

Occupying an intermediate position between the noun and the verb, the noun of action, on the one hand, has the form of a case, possessiveness, and plurality; on the other – indicates action or state that is adjacent to the verb vocabulary.

The form ending in –ish in some Turkic languages is considered as one of the non-personal forms of the verb.

The nouns of action with the affix -ish/-esh are widely used in Turkmen, Uzbek, Uighur, Altai, Bashkir and other languages.

The nouns of action ending in -(i)sh does not have its own temporary value, i.e., it is indifferent to the temporary characteristics of action (Mamatov, 1988).

2. Materials and Methods

In the paper, we used a range of linguistic methods which is a descriptive and comparative historical. Hence, the research was conducted in synchronic and diachronic aspects. The study involves materials of modern Turkic languages and dialects.

3. Results and discussion

In Turkological sources it is noted that in modern Altai literary language, including its dialects and sub-dialects, nouns of action gradually lose their verbal characteristics and go to the category of nouns [Baskakov, 1972].

The noun of action ending in -ish, as rightly pointed out by S. A. Sokolov, "...it is a very ancient form. In the monuments of Bilge Kagan

and Kül-Tegin this form occurs in four examples: Urush from ur –to beat, to strike... In the ancient monuments of Uighur written language is also found this form: ilis- "hitching" from "strap on", alqus –"blessing" with a "s" instead of "sh" on the end of the word that... is typical for ancient Turkic monuments, -in the Sutra "Golden glow"; bilis – "getting familiar", -in Kutadgu-Bilig, etc." [Sokolov, 1952].

In modern Turkic languages The noun of action ending in –(i)sh especially productive in Uighur, Uzbek and Turkmen [Blagova, 1976; Mamatov, 1988], and in the Kyrgyz [Toychubekova, 1968] languages. In comparison with the forms ending in –y, the form –mak is less common in the Karakalpak and Kazakh languages. [Kutlymuratov, 1963; Netalieva, 1963].

In the modern Altai language the only forms endings in –ysh, -ish, -ush, -sh are considered as the noun of action: Bu, ulustyn keliji kachan toktoor? (B. Ukachin, 1985) - When the stop walking these people? etc.

The value of a procedural of the forms ending in -(i)sh proofs that these forms are nouns of action.

However, despite this, in the Altai language, like other Turkic languages, there are cases of lexicalization of this form. For example, words such as ulesh - 'share', sogush - 'fight'; bolush - 'help', ochosh - 'stubborn' fully moved into the category of nouns or adjectives.

The noun of action ending in -(i)sh in the Altai language is nearly formed from any verbal stem. This form in the Altai language takes possessive affixes, and combines with postpositions: Taryctyn yureginin tipildeji tiniy berdi - The heartbeat of Tarik became more rapid etc. (Shodoyev, 1984).

When the noun of action ending in -(i)sh taking possessive affixes, an opportunity appears to specify the subject of action, which belongs to the "objectified" action. In this case, nouns or personal pronouns could be the means serving for the expression of possessiveness, in addition to the possessive affixes: Kolhoztyn yaandary menin beletenijimdi shindep kororgo kelip yat– Chiefs of collective farms come to explore my training (Shodoyev, 1984).

The nouns of action ending in -(i)sh in the dative, accusative, locative, genitive and instrumental cases are the most common use.

One of the important features of the Altai noun of action ending in –(i)sh is that it has no negative forms. The value of negation is expressed by analytical way, through negative word yok - no: yayim otyrysh yok– There is no calm sitting (Shodoyev, 1984).

Form ending in –(i)sh in the Altai language can perform the function the attribute and determinatum: Kyzylcheruchilder yuuchil yol-yorikka beletenishti bashtadithe - Red army began preparations for a military campaign (Shodoyev, 1984).

In the modern Bashkir language this form is the most substantivized, takes the case and personal affixes, and can be combined with affixes of plurality: Byl kyskyryshtyn yakshiga alyp kilmeuyen anlaha la, ul uzen tiya almany `Although he knew that the noise would do no good, he couldn't control himself`(Dmitriyev, 1948).

The noun of action in nominative, dative, accusative, instrumental and locative-temporal cases in the modern Bashkir language acts in the sentence as subject, predicate, circumstances, and object.

In old Uzbek language form ending in –ish is mostly registered in the texts in which the traces of the Kipchak influence are observed. This form in the old Uzbek language is infrequent.

Consider the examples: alarnyn kelishini kordum – I saw them coming; kelish – his coming; urush – battle, etc. [Sherbak, 1962].

The noun of action on –sh, -ish, -esh in the modern Tatar language is infrequent: soylesh – speaking, kaytish – return, etc. As you can see, the words with the affixes –ish in the Tatar language primarily act as a verbal noun [Tatar grammar, 1993].

In the Turkmen language form ending in –ysh/-ish/-ush/-sh (-yish/-yish) is the most common compared to other forms of action nouns.

The nouns of action ending in –ish4 in the Turkmen language does not express a temporary trace and could be used both in the present and in the past and the future tenses. Consider the examples: Olar ishlerini tashlap, galandarin gazal okayshina gen galip seretdiler – Suspending the work, they listened with surprise to the reading of poems by wanderer (Seytekov, 1962), etc.

A negative aspect of this form arisen by joining the verbal stem a negative particle ending in –ma/-me: Bu gyzyn hich vagt tertibi bozmayshy mugallimin govnuni goteryerdi – the disposition of the teacher to raise discipline of this girl [The grammar of the Turkmen language, 1982].

The following feature of the form ending in –ish4 draws attention in the Turkmen language. So, this form is not combined with the words gerek – need, islemek - to want, mumkin – can, etc.

Form ending in –ish4 in Turkmen language takes possessive affixes (okayishim - my reading, okayishi – his reading), case affixes (okayshimda (locative case) – in my reading, okayshima (dative case) -to my reading).

The noun of action ending in –ish4 in the modern Turkmen language in some cases combined with the particle –ay/-ey/-da/-de. Combined with this particle, this form passes the traces of astonishment. Note that the particle –ay/-ey is next to affix ending

in –ish4. For example: Bay, onun jaytarilip gachayshini! – Oh, what's his playful run! (Kerbabaev, 1965), etc.

In the Karakalpak language form ending in –ish4 has the following phonetic variants: -ys/-is, -s. Like other Turkic languages, in the Karakalpak language this form also has a neutral temporal trace: juris – walking, bilis – knowledge, etc. [Baskakov, 1952].

4. Conclusions

Thus, we can assume that the noun of action ending in –ish in the Turkic languages is not the product of the word-formative, but inflectional operations, as these formations can be practically derived from every verb. Such criteria as seme of procedure, the ability to accept the verbal case endings, interaction with the voice category allow you to believe that it is not a noun, but the noun of action. A comparative analysis of the form ending in -ish in the Turkic languages has permitted to identify the similar and differential features of this form in semantics, forms of expression, and also in syntactic functions.

In fact, the nouns of action in modern Turkic languages appear as the result of historical processes, the evolution of grammatical phenomena, forms. Along with this is revealed that the basis of the system of grammatical forms is long-standing, established forms, though they have different origins.

Despite the fact that the nouns of actions of the verb in the Turkic languages are developed forms, some of them are new formations.

The noun of action ending in -ish in the Turkic languages is a verb form that conveys action of the subject in the object image and has no temporal seme. This action is not the absolute action; it is a substantivized action.

References

1. Akhundov AA (1976). Masdar. Azerbaijani language and literature acquisition, №2, pp. 48- 51.

2. Aliyev V (1986). The non-personal forms of the verb of the Azerbaijani language. Masdar, Baku.
3. Arakin VD (1988). Infinitive. Comparative-histo-rical grammar of Turkic languages. Morphology. pp. 475-486.
4. Bagirov G (1971). Lexical-semantic development of verbs in Azerbaijani language. Maarif. Baku.
5. Balakayev MB (1959). The modern Kazakh language. Alma-Ata, 235 p.
6. Baskakov NK (1952). The Karakalpak language. vol. 2, part 1, Publishing House “Science”, Moscow, 543 p.
7. Batmanov IA (1940). Grammar of the Kyrgyz language. Vol. III, Frunze.
8. Blagova GF (1976).The action nouns in the Turkic languages of the Central Asian region. Turkic studies, M., 347 p.
9. Borovkov AA (1935). Textbook of Uyghur langu-age. Publishing house of Leningrad East Institute, L., 227 p.
10. Chommadov O (1992). Kerkinsky group of dialects of Turkmen language (in areal – historical aspect), PhD Thesis`s abstract, Ashgabat, March, 38 p.
11. Comparative-historical grammar of the Turkic languages. Morphology. (1988). Moscow, Publishing House "Science", 553 p.
12. Damirchizadeh E (1999). The language of Kitabi-Dede Korkud`s epos (second edition), Publishing House “Science”, Baku, 140 p.
13. Dmitriev NK (1948). Grammar of the Bashkir language, M.-L., 276 p.
14. Dyrenkova NP (1940). Grammar of the Oyrot language, Publishing house of AS of USSR, M. - L., 302 p.
15. Gordlevski VA (1928). Grammar of the Turkish language. Publishing House of the Institute of oriental studies, M, 159p.
16. Guzev VG (1976). System nominal forms of the Turkic verb as a morphological category (on the Basis of Old Anatolian and Turkish languages. Turcologica: the 70th anniversary of academician A. N. Kononov, L., pp. 45-57.
17. Huseynzadeh MH (1983). Modern Azerbaijani language. Morphology. Publishing House “Maarif”, Baku, 275 p.
18. Ishbaev KG (1975). Infinitive form of the verb in the Bashkir language. PhD Thesis`s abstract, Ufa, May, 28 p.
19. Iskhakov F (1960). The nouns of action and the state in modern Uzbek language. PhD Thesis`s abstract, Samarkand, June, 29 p.
20. Jafarov S, Abasov E (1946). The infinitive of the Azerbaijani language, I part, Baku, October.
21. Katanov NF (1903). Research experience of Uryankhay language with indication of its pivotal related connections to other languages of the Turkic root. Vol. 1-2. – Kazan.
22. Kazimbek M (1846). General grammar of the Turkish-Tatar language. University press, Kazan. 466 p.
23. Kerbabaev B (1971). Collected works. Turkmenistan, Ashgabad, 2400 p.
24. Khanbutayeva LM (2003). The infinitive in the modern Azerbaijani and English language (common-typological research), “The world of books”, Baku, 130 p.

25. Kononov AN (1956). Grammar of modern Turkish literary language. Publishing house of AS of USSR, M.-L., 569 p.
26. Kutlymuratov BK (1968). The nouns of action in modern Karakalpak language. PhD Thesis`s abstract, Nukus, 24 p., November.
27. Madatova R (2002). Masdar in the written monuments of Azerbaijani language of XIII-XVIIIth centuries. “Nurlan”, Baku, 130 p.
28. Mamatov MSh (1988). On the category of nominalization of action. Soviet Turkology, “Science” 1988, pp. 47-62.
29. Melioransky PM (1894). The brief grammar of Kazakh-Kyrgyz language. Direct Media, SPb, 87 p.
30. Meliyev K (1964). The nouns of action in the modern Uyghur language. Publishing House of Uz USSR AS Institute of language and literature named after Pushkin, Moscow, 105 p.
31. Meshadiyeva AE (2012). Comparative-historical analysis of infinitive ending in -ma/-me in the Turkic languages. The world of science, culture, education, №6 (37), december, Gorno-Altaisk, ISSN 1991-5497, pp. 39-43.
32. Meshadiyeva AE (2013). Synchronous-Diachro-nic analysis of infinitive ending in -mak/-mek in the Turkic languages. The works of the Institute of linguistics, 1, Baku, pp. 82-99.
33. Meshadiyeva AE (2013). On some common and differential features of the infinitive form ending in –arga/-erge in the turkic languages. VI İnter-national scientific-practical conference “Fun-damental and applied researches: problems and conclusions”, 30 August, Novosibirsk, pp. 177-185.
34. Meshadiyeva AE (2015). Comparative-historical analysis of the infinitive form in –*oov* in the Turkic languages. Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, ISSN 2039-9340 (print) ISSN 2039-2117 (online), Vol. 6, No 6 S2, November, MCSER Publishing, Rome-Italy, pp. 203-209.

35. Mirzazadeh H (1962). The historical morphology of the Azerbaijani language. Azertedrisneshr, Baku, 370 p.
36. Modern Azerbaijani language (1980). II vol., Azertedrisneshr, Baku, 510 p.
37. Nasilov VM (1965). The Verbal nouns in their development in the Turkic languages. The issues of Turkic Philology. “Science”, Tashkent, 210 p.
38. Netalieva Kh (1963). The nouns of action in modern Kazakh language (forms ending in -oo, -mak). PhD Thesis, Alma-Ata, September, 147 p.
39. Pokrovskaya LA (1964). Grammar of the Gagauz language. Publishing House “Science”, Moscow, 298 p.
40. Reshetov VV (1965). The fundamentals of phonetics and grammar of the Uzbek language. “Teacher”, Tashkent, 282 p.
41. Serebrennikov BA, Hajiyeva NZ (1979). Com-parative-historical grammar of Turkic languages. Publishing house “Maarif”, Baku, 303 p.

42. Sevortyan EV (1955). On the problem of parts of speech in Turkic languages. Questions of the gram-matical structure. M., Publishing House “Science” pp. 188-225.
43. Seytekov B (1988). The brothers I, Publishing House “Turkmenistan”, Ashgabad, 456 p.
44. Sherbak AM (1962). The grammar of Old Uzbek language. Publishing House of USSR AS, M-L, 274 p.
45. Shodoyev I (1984). Difficult years. Altai Pedantic Publishing House, Gorno-Altaysk, 278 p.
46. Sokolov SA (1952). On some verbal nouns in the Turkish language (Verbal nouns ending in –dik, - acak, - mak, - maklik, -ma, -ish). Publishing House “Science”, M., 145 p.
47. Tatar grammar. Morphology. (1993). Vol. II, Tat- knigoizdat, Kazan, 397 p.
48. Toychubekova B (1968). The nouns of action in the Kyrgyz language. PhD Thesis`s abstract, Frunze, March, 24 p.
49. Tydykova N (2007). On features of noun of action in Altai language. Turkish Studies, Volume 2/2, Spring, Turkey, pp. 665-679.
50. Ukachin B (1985). Mountains and he will stay. Gorno-Altaysk, 236 p.
51. Yusupov FYu (1985). Non-personal forms of the verb in dialects of the Tatar language. Kazan Publishing House, Kazan, 283 p.